

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 5 and the addition of new Figures 8 and 9. Part numbers 82a, 82b, 83,84 and 85 are added to Figure 5. A completely new set of Figures is submitted as the number of sheets has changed.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)  
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-7, 9-13 and 15-21 are pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 1, 9 and 16 are amended and claims 8, 14 and 17 are canceled. Figure 5 is amended and Figures 8 and 9 are added.

Page 2 of the Office Action objects to the drawings due to minor informalities. Amendments to Figures 3 and 5 have eliminated the informalities. It is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings due to minor informalities be withdrawn.

Page 2 of the Office Action objects to the amendments to paragraphs 0010 and 0012, asserting that the amendments comprise the matter and/or are repetition. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The amendments to paragraphs 0010 and 0012 address alternate linkage pin supports which may be attached to alternate linkages and removably attached to the load bearing support. These subjects are specifically addressed in the original paragraphs 0003 through 0005 under the "Summary of the Invention" section of the specification and, thus, do not constitute new matter but are, instead, to be viewed as inherent to the original application. Further, the subject matter is not repetitious as it is not otherwise addressed in the application. It is respectfully requested that the objection to the amendments to paragraphs 0010 and 0012 as comprising new subject matter and/or repetition be withdrawn.

Page 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-6 and 8-18 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Apgar et al. or Abe et al. as applied and for the reasons set forth in paragraph numeral 5 of the Office Action mailed 7/15/2007. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 recites,

A linkage support system for a work vehicle, the work vehicle including a frame, a work tool, and a linkage for manipulating the work tool, the frame having a left mast portion and a right mast portion, the linkage support system comprising:  
at least one fastener;  
a load bearing support, the load bearing support being a portion of the frame located between the left mast portion and the right mast portion;

a linkage pin support; and  
an alternate linkage pin support, the linkage pin support  
removably attached to the load bearing support via the at least one  
fastener, the load bearing support capable of being removably  
attached to the alternate linkage pin support, the linkage pin  
support coupled to the linkage, the alternate linkage pin support  
capable of being coupled to an alternate linkage. (Emphasis  
added).

The remaining independent claims, claims 9 and 16 recites similar features. Neither of the cited references, alone or combined, disclose an alternate linkage pin support capable of being removably attached to the load bearing support and an alternate linkage as recited in independent claims 1, 9 and 16. Further, none of the cited references remotely suggest these features. Moreover, the cited references cannot disclose or suggest the features of dependent claims 2-7, 10-13, 15 and 18-21 as these claims depend from claims 1, 9 and 16 and recite additional features. Finally, the rejection is moot with respect to claims 8, 14 and 17 as these claims are canceled. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-18 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Apgar et al. or Abe et al., as applied and for the reasons set forth in paragraph numeral 5 of the Office Action mailed 7/15/2007, be withdrawn.

Page 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 7, 19, 20 and 21 as unpatentable over Abe, et al. in view of Mandon as applied and for the reasons set forth in paragraph 6 of the Office Action mailed 7/15/2007. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As demonstrated above, Abe, et al. does not disclose or suggest every feature of independent claims 1, 9 and 16. Further, Mandon does not disclose those features but is merely cited for some additional features recited in the rejected claims 7, 19, 20 and 21. Thus, neither Abe et al. no Mandon, alone a combined, disclose every feature recited in claims 7, 19, 20 and 21. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 7, 19, 20 and 21 as unpatentable over Abe, et al. in view of Mandon as applied and for the reasons set forth in paragraph 6 of the Office Action mailed 7/15/2007 be withdrawn.

Page 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-6 and 8-18 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Apgar et al. or Abe et al. in view of Gilstrap or Schwalenberg et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As demonstrated above, neither Apgar et al. or Abe et al. disclose or suggest every feature of the amended claims 1, 9 and 16. Further, neither Gilstrap nor Schwalenberg remotely suggest these features. Thus, none of the cited references, alone or combined, disclose every feature of the amended complaint. Moreover, none of the cited references, alone or combined, can disclose every feature of dependent claims 2-7, 9-13, 15 and 18-21 as these claims depend from claims 1, 9 and 16 and recites additional features. Finally, the rejection is moot with respect to claims 8, 14 and 17 as these claims are canceled. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-18 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Apgar et al. or Abe et al. in view of Gilstrap or Schwalenberg et al. be withdrawn.

Page 4 of the Office Action rejects claims 7, 19, 20 and 21 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Abe et al. in view of Gilstrap or Schwalenberg as applied to claims 1 and 16 above and further in view of Mandon as applied in the final rejection mailed 3/20/2006. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As demonstrated above, Abe et al., Gilstrap and Schwalenberg, alone or combined, do not disclose or suggest every feature of amended independent claims 1 and 16. Further, it has also been demonstrated that Mandon does not disclose or suggest these features. Thus, none of these references, alone or combined, disclose or suggest every feature of claims 7, 19, 20 and 21 as these claims depend from claims 1 and 16 and recites additional features. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 7, 19, 20 and 21 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Abe et al. in view of Gilstrap or Schwalenberg as applied to claims 1 and 16 above and further in view of Mandon as applied in the final rejection mailed 3/20/2006 be withdrawn.

Page 5 of the Office Action rejects claims 15 and 21 twice with some redundancy. Applicant will address the strongest and most specific rejection to avoid confusion. Page number five rejects claims 15 and 21 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Apgar et al. or Abe et al. in view of Gilstrap or Schwalenberg as applied to claims 11 and 20 above, and further in view of WO/47833. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As demonstrated above, Apgar et al., Abe et al., Gilstrap and Schwalenberg, alone or combined, do not disclose or suggest every feature of independent claims 1, 9 and 16. Thus, these references cannot disclose his suggest every feature of dependent claims 15 and 21 as these claims depend from the independent claims and recite additional features. WO/47833 is merely cited to include extending hydraulic hoses in the access hole and, thus, is not disclose the features of the independent claims. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 15 and 21 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Apgar et al. or Abe et al. in view of Gilstrap or Schwalenberg as applied to claims 11 and 20 above, and further in view of WO/47833 be withdrawn.

In conclusion, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525.

Respectfully,

/Hope W. Carter, Reg. No. 46,604/  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Hope W. Carter  
Reg. No. 46,604  
Patent Department  
Deere & Company  
One John Deere Place  
Moline, IL 61265  
Telephone No. (309) 765-4380

5/8

FIG. 5

